



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,458	03/27/2001	Geoffrey S. Martin	2409.3273.3US	2544

7590 02/20/2004

Kent S. Burningham, Esq.
TRASKBRITT
Suite 300
230 South 500 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

EXAMINER

SIRMONS, KEVIN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3763

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2004

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/819,458

Applicant(s)

MARTIN ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin C. Simons

Art Unit

3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-29,31 and 42-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-29,31 and 42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 43-45 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2, 15, 16.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Species II, Figs. 13 and 14 in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged. Applicant has indicated that claims 24-29, 31 and 42-45 are directed to a triple lumen catheter.

Claims 30 and 32-41 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 14.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: an outer tube; an inner tube; a first septum; a second septum; a second lumen; a second aperture; and a third aperture. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: See an outer tube; an inner tube; a first septum; a second septum; a second lumen; a second aperture; and a third aperture.

Art Unit: 3763

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 24-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 24, it is unclear what applicant regards as an outer tube; an inner tube; a first septum; a second septum; a second lumen; a second aperture; and a third aperture. Specify by reference numeral.

Note: The claims are replete with vague and indefinite language. Upon correction of the 112 rejections, the claims may be rejected under 102, 103 or other 112 rejections and the case made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 24-29, 31 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Ekholmer U.S. Pat. No. 4,717,379.

Ekholmer discloses an outer tube having a proximal end and a distal end (6); an inner tube (5) having a proximal end and a distal end defining there within a first lumen (2), said inner tube having an outer diameter less than the inner diameter of said outer tube (fig. 3),

Art Unit: 3763

said inner tube being disposed within said outer tube to define an interior space between the outside of said inner tube and the inside of said outer tube (fig. 3), the inner diameter of said inner tube being sized as to accommodate an insertion guide wire having an outer diameter in a range from about 0.036 inches to about 0.038 inches (It is the examiner's position that the inner tube is sized to accommodate the aforementioned guide wire without destroying the device of Ekholmer. Furthermore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to change the dimension of the catheter so that the inner tube, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Additionally, applicant has not disclosed that the dimensions of the guidewire solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with any guide wire sized to fit into Ekholmer's catheter; a first septum; a second septum; a second lumen; a third lumen; a tapered distal tip; a first, second and third (figs. 1-3); as to claims 26-29 and 31, (fig. 1-3);

As to claim 25, Ekholmer discloses a catheter substantially as claimed except for the size of the inner diameter of the inner tube is about 0.04 inches. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to change the dimension of the catheter so that the inner tube, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). Furthermore, applicant has not disclosed that the dimensions of the inner tube solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well the catheter as disclosed by Ekholmer.

Art Unit: 3763

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 24-29, 31 and 42-45 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 5,797,869; claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,472,417; claims 1-33 of U.S. Pat. No. 5,472,417 and claims 1-18 of U.S. Pat. 6,206,849. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the only difference between the claims is minor changes in language and the mere failure to claim certain limitations in the instant claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Kevin C. Sirmons whose telephone number is (703) 306-5410. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 am to 4:00 pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.



Kevin C. Sirmons
Patent Examiner
2/19/04